

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 10, 1997 LB 111

Our medical centers are both well-regarded and well-known for what they have done in terms of research in the area of human genetics, and yet we are behind the curve in terms of policy. And so this commission would be a forum for discussion by individuals who are very knowledgeable in this area about the kinds of policy issues that there are, and they would make recommendations to the Legislature about policy development and adoption. Some of the areas that would be considered would be the privacy of human genetic testing information. On a national level, Kennedy-Kassebaum prohibits discrimination in the area of health care coverage by virtue of participation in genetic testing, and there's a Domenici bill that is pending right now that is even more explicit in that regard. Twenty states have adopted legislation in the area of privacy of human genetic testing information, and the way that that can be used by insurers. Secondly, the use of human genetic technology in the criminal justice system, the area of criminal databanking and fingerprinting. Many states are very far along in what they allow in terms of the use of human genetic technology in the criminal justice system, and we are one of the states that probably has the least policy in this regard. And finally, in the area of the regulation of testing technology, the quality control aspect and whether there's some things that we need to be involved in in guaranteeing the accuracy of testing technology. The commission would be made up of 20 to 25 individuals with specific expertise in the area of human genetics. It would have a one year sunset, and that's a real important feature, as far as I'm concerned. This commission is not to exist in perpetuity. It is to be a forum, but it is to be a forum in a limited extent that it would make policy recommendations to us. It would provide prospective guidelines...it would allow us to have prospective guidelines rather than to be in the situation which we very well are now in being reactive. All of the speakers who testified spoke in support of the commission, and some of them had a sense of urgency in their support of it because they are so concerned that we will choose to be reactive rather than perspective in the way that we adopt policy in this area. And because we are so far behind, many of the other states, in developing policy, that helps protect us in a burgeoning field that many of us do not fully comprehend the implications of. Individuals knowledgeable in this area were concerned that we proceed in the